

# QUANTUM FIELD THEORY AND THE HELIUM ATOM: 101 YEARS LATER \*

J. SUCHER

*Department of Physics, University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742, U.S.A.*

February 1, 2008

## Abstract

Helium was first isolated on Earth in 1895, by Sir William Ramsey. One hundred and one years later, it seems like a good time to review our current theoretical understanding of the helium atom. Helium has played an important role both in the development of quantum mechanics and in quantum field theory. The early history of helium is sketched. Various aspects of the modern theory are described in some detail, including (1) the computation of fine structure to order  $\alpha^2 Ry$  and  $\alpha^3 Ry$ , (2) the decay of metastable states, and (3) Rydberg states and long-range forces. A brief survey is made of some of the recent work on the quantum field theory of  $He$  and  $He$ -like ions.

---

\*Invited talk: “Quantum Systems: New Trends and Methods”, Minsk, June 3-7, 1996

# 1 Introduction

The title of my talk is inspired by that of a famous novel by Gabriel Garcia Marquéz: “100 years of solitude.” Helium, whose existence was not even suspected till the middle of the 19th century, has experienced exactly 101 years of attention since its terrestrial discovery in 1895. It has played a major role in the development of atomic, nuclear, and condensed matter physics. The helium atom, and its cousins, the  $He$ -like ions, continue to be a subject of active study. It has played an important role, second only to hydrogen, both in the development of quantum mechanics and that of quantum field theory (QFT). Since this atom is, in the sense of the title of this conference, a quantum system *par excellence*, I thought this would be an appropriate time to review the history of this subject, with emphasis on the QFT aspects.

I will begin (Sec. 2) with a historical sketch concerning the discovery of helium, first in the Sun and then on Earth, including some fascinating facts which I gleaned by browsing through a wonderful book by Isaac Asimov.[1] (I take special pleasure in referring to Asimov, for several reasons: He was born in Belarus (Petrovici, 1920) and he is a distant relative of one of the members of the organizing committee! Moreover, he obtained his higher degrees at Columbia University, where I was a student many years later.) I will then describe the importance of the role played by study of  $He$  in the development of quantum mechanics (Sec. 3) and in the early stages of quantum electrodynamics (QED) (Sec. 4). I then turn to developments beginning in the 1950’s, including the first calculation of atomic energy levels to accuracy  $\alpha^3 Ry$  (Sec. 5). Next, I will consider the theory of the decays of excited states of  $He$  and  $He$ -like ions, especially of metastable states, in which the Sun enters our story once again (Sec. 6). In Sec. 7, I note the role played by study of high-lying, so-called Rydberg states ( $n \geq 10$ ) of  $He$  in advancing the theory of long-range forces arising from two-photon exchange. I conclude in Sec. 8 with a brief survey of some of the recent work involving QED and  $He$ -like systems.

## 2 The discovery of helium: From Janssen to Ramsay

The story begins with someone whom you have probably never heard of, one P.J.C. Janssen (1822-1907). From his name you might think he is yet another one of those Scandinavians who have contributed so much to the discovery of the elements ... but you would be wrong. The initials stand for Pierre Jules Cesar and his name is pronounced in the French manner (Zhahn-sen'). Born in Paris, Janssen was a great traveler in the interests of astronomy. He went to Peru and the Azores, to Italy and Greece, to Japan and Siam. In 1868, still without benefit of United/Lufthansa and the like, he traveled to India to observe a total eclipse of the sun. More about that in a moment. But to give you an idea of Janssen's daring and determination, I add that in 1870, when Paris was besieged by the Prussians, and Janssen was eager to get to Algeria to observe another total eclipse, he escaped from Paris by balloon flight! During his observations in India, Janssen noticed a strange spectral line and forwarded his data to Sir Norman Joseph Lockyer (1836-1920), a British astronomer who was a pioneer in the study of solar spectra and coined the term "chromosphere". Lockyer compared the position of Janssen's line to lines of known elements and concluded that it must belong to an as yet unknown element, possibly not even existing on earth. He named it helium, after the Greek work for the sun, "helios". But his suggestion was dismissed by chemists, who were not prepared to accept the existence of a new element on what was then regarded (not without reason) as a flimsy basis. Indeed subsequently, many new lines were discovered and incorrectly attributed to new elements, such as "coronium", "nebulium," and so on; all of these turned out to correspond to ionized states of known elements.

Our story now turns to the two R's, Rayleigh and Ramsay. Lord Rayleigh (1842-1919) is known to most of us for his work in mathematical physics. But he was also a great experimentalist. During an extensive series of measurements on the density of gases, undertaken as a test of Prout's hypothesis, he noted that the density of nitrogen obtained from the air appeared to be very slightly higher than that of the nitrogen obtained from chemical compounds, unlike the case with oxygen. In frustration he wrote to the journal *Nature*, (founded in 1869 by Lockyer himself and still going strong) for suggestions. In response, after getting permission from Rayleigh to do so (!), the

matter was taken up by Sir William Ramsay (1852-1916) in 1892. Ramsay remembered that a century earlier Cavendish had found that when he tried to combine the nitrogen of the air with oxygen a final bubble of air was left over, which Cavendish speculated to be a gas heavier than nitrogen which did not combine with oxygen. Ramsay repeated the experiment of Cavendish and found a similar bubble. Using the now available spectroscope, Ramsay and Rayleigh studied the lines from the left-over gas and identified for the first time a zero-valence element, which they called “argon,” from the Greek word for inert. With the periodic table as a guide, Ramsay guessed that there might be a whole column of inert elements and began the search. In 1895, following up earlier work of the American geologist W. Hillebrand, he isolated a gas from a uranium mineral called cleveite, previously mistaken for nitrogen, which showed the same bright spectral line seen by Janssen over 25 years before. Helium had been found on Earth! Later, starting with liquid argon, Ramsay isolated three more inert gases: neon (new), krypton (hidden) and xenon (stranger). In 1904, Ramsay and Rayleigh received the Nobel Prizes for chemistry and physics, respectively, for their work on the inert gases.

### **3 Helium and quantum mechanics: From Bohr to Hylleraas**

Within a decade or so after its discovery, helium began to be of great importance in the development of atomic, nuclear and condensed matter physics. With regard to condensed-matter physics, in 1908 Kammerlingh-Onnes liquified helium at 4 K; in 1911 he used helium in the discovery of superconductivity. With regard to nuclear physics, helium was in at the beginning: Rutherford’s discovery of the first nucleus, that of gold, involved an  $\alpha$ -particle beam and in 1906-1909 Geiger and Rutherford identified the  $\alpha$ -particle as the doubly ionized helium atom.

The discovery of the atomic nucleus led directly to the Bohr model and to Bohr’s explanation of the spectrum of hydrogen in terms of quantization of the action. However, the attempt by Bohr and Sommerfeld to extend the model to account for the spectrum of helium failed. In the 1920’s this failure led in part to the discovery of quantum mechanics by Heisenberg and

Schrödinger and, in particular, to the Schrödinger equation for the stationary states of the hydrogen atom or hydrogen-like ions:

$$h(1)\phi(1) = [\frac{\mathbf{p}_1^2}{2m} + U_C(1)]\phi(1) = W\phi(1). \quad (1)$$

with  $U_C(1)$  the Coulomb interaction of the electron with a point nucleus:  $U_C(1) = -Ze^2/4\pi r_1$ . With the constraint that  $\phi$  is normalizable, one recovers the Bohr levels as eigenvalues of  $h(1)$ .

What about helium? Within the Schrödinger framework the energy levels ought to be determined by

$$h(1, 2)\phi(1, 2) = W\phi(1, 2), \quad (2)$$

where

$$h(1, 2) = h(1) + h(2) + U_C(1, 2), \quad (3)$$

with  $U_C(1, 2) = e^2/4\pi r_{12}$ . Since (2) can no longer be solved analytically, approximation methods must be used. This problem was attacked in the later 1920's by several authors but most successfully by Egil Hylleraas [2] who, many years before Mandelstam, introduced a set of  $s$ ,  $t$  and  $u$  variables into physics which were to become famous:

$$s = r_1 + r_2, \quad t = r_1 - r_2, \quad u = r_{12}. \quad (4)$$

For spherically symmetric ( $L = 0$ ) states, the spatial wave function  $\phi(1, 2)$  may be taken to depend only on these rotationally invariant variables. As an ansatz for the application of the variational principle

$$\delta \langle \phi | h(1, 2) | \phi \rangle = 0, \quad (5)$$

Hylleraas wrote

$$\phi = \phi(s, t, u) = f(ks, kt, ku). \quad (6)$$

Here  $k$  is a "nonlinear parameter" and  $f$  is of the form [in atomic units]

$$f(s, t, u) = e^{-s/2} P(s, t, u), \quad (7)$$

with  $P(s, t, u)$  a multinomial in  $s$ ,  $t$ , and  $u$ :

$$P(s, t, u) = \sum c_{n, 2l, m} s^n t^{2l} u^m \quad (8)$$

involving "linear parameters"  $c_{ijk}$ . With a six-parameter  $P$ , his result for the energy of the helium ground state gave for the ionization energy,  $J_{th} = 1.8065$  Ry, to be compared with the experimental value at that time,  $J_{exp} = 1.807$  Ry. This agreement, to better than a part in  $10^3$ , was important in putting the approach to atomic spectra based on a many-body Schrödinger equation on firm, quantitative ground.

In the subsequent 60 years, and especially after the advent of modern computers, the increasingly precise study of the discrete spectrum of the non-relativistic Hamiltonian (1) developed into a small industry. As I will describe later, in recent years this study has in fact taken a great leap forward. The obvious generalization of (3) to an  $N$ -electron atom or ion ( $N > 2$ ), when supplemented by the antisymmetry principle and electron spin wave functions, constitutes the foundation of the nonrelativistic theory of atomic spectra.

## 4 Helium and QED: From Darwin to Breit

### 4.1 *The patchwork era*

Of course, no matter how accurately (3) is solved, the energy levels obtained from it are not accurate enough for comparison with very precise experiments. Even in classical electrodynamics (CED), the interaction between two point-like charged particles is not given just by their Coulomb interaction, which is all that is included in (3). Already in 1920, Darwin[3] had shown how the inclusion of relativistic effects in CED leads, to order  $v^2/c^2$ , to an effective Lagrangian interaction term of the form

$$L_{int} = \frac{(e_1 e_2 / 4\pi c^2)(\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})}{2r}. \quad (9)$$

Upon quantization, this leads to a version of what later came to be called the **orbit-orbit interaction**,  $U_{o-o}$ . Further, after the discovery of electron spin and the associated magnetic moment, it was clear that to describe the fine-structure accurately one would have to include not only the **spin-self-orbit interaction**  $U_{s-s-o}$  (i) of each electron with the nucleus, as in the case of hydrogen, but also a **spin-other-orbit interaction**  $U_{s-o-o}$  (1,2) and a **spin-spin interaction**  $U_{s-s}$  (1,2). These terms could be, and were,

written down by analogy with the corresponding classical terms, although not completely correctly in the case of  $U_{s-s}$ . It was also clear that at this level of accuracy ( $\alpha^2 Ry$ ) one should include, again as in H, the relativistic kinetic energy correction  $U_{kin}$  proportional to  $\mathbf{p}_i^4/m^3$ , for each electron "i".

Is that all? The discovery of the (one-electron) Dirac equation led one to expect additional terms. Reduction to nonrelativistic form of the Dirac equation for H or an H-like ion, viz.

$$(h_D(1) + U_C(1))\psi = E\psi, \quad [h_D(1) \equiv \alpha_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 + \beta_1 m] \quad (10)$$

leads not only to the spin-orbit and kinetic energy corrections but also to a contact term  $U_{cont}(1)$ , the so-called "S-state interaction", which has no classical analogue. Clearly, there must be counterparts of this in the case of helium. In summary, as a result of all this patchwork, one expects the leading correction to the energy levels obtained from (2) to take the form

$$W^{(2)} = \langle \psi_{SP} | U_{eff}^{(2)} | \psi_{SP} \rangle \quad (11)$$

where  $\psi_{SP}(1, 2)$  is a Schrödinger-Pauli (SP) type wave function and

$$U_{eff}^{(2)} = U_{s.i.} + U_{s.d.} \quad (12)$$

with  $U_{s.i.}$  and  $U_{s.d.}$  the spin-independent and spin-dependent parts of the effective interaction  $U_{eff}^{(2)}$ :

$$U_{s.i.} = \Sigma[U_{kin}(i) + U_{cont}(i)] + U_{o-o}(1, 2), \quad (13)$$

$$U_{s.d.} = \Sigma U_{s-o}(i) + U_{s-o-o}(1, 2) + U_{s-s}(1, 2). \quad (14)$$

I will write down the explicit expressions later [Sec. 5.2].

## 4.2 The next stage

Even if the interaction between two electrons were perfectly described by  $U_C(r_{12})$ , it was evident that to take into account relativistic and spin-dependent effects in a unified and systematic way it would be desirable to construct a generalization of the one-electron Dirac equation to two electrons. The first steps in this direction and in improving the above patchwork approach were taken by J.B. Gaunt[4] and especially by Gregory Breit.[5]

#### 4.2.1 The two-electron Dirac-Coulomb Hamiltonian.

As a starting point for a relativistic description of the *He* atom, Breit took what appears to be an obvious extension of (10): He replaced the 4-component Dirac spinor  $\psi(1)$  by a  $4 \times 4 = 16$  component spinor  $\psi(1, 2)$  and required that it be an eigenfunction of an operator which is simply the sum of the  $h_D^{ext}(i)$ , and  $U_C(1, 2)$ . I like to call this operator the (two-electron) Dirac-Coulomb Hamiltonian and denote it by  $H_{DC}(1, 2)$  :

$$H_{DC}(1, 2) = h_D^{ext}(1) + h_D^{ext}(2) + U_C(r_{12}). \quad (15)$$

In this notation, Breit's requirement takes the form

$$H_{DC}\psi(1, 2) = E\psi(1, 2). \quad (16)$$

The normalizable solutions of this equation were presumed to give a good description of the discrete states of the helium atom.

#### 4.2.2 Transverse photon exchange and the Breit operator.

Next, Breit took into account effects arising from the interaction of the electrons with the quantized radiation field  $\mathbf{A}_T(\mathbf{x})$  by including the interaction which, in this context is given by

$$H_T = \sum e\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_T(\mathbf{r}_i) \quad (17)$$

Using second-order perturbation theory and dropping terms which correspond to self-interaction, Breit argued that to a good approximation the level shift  $\Delta E$  arising from this interaction would be given by

$$\Delta E = \langle \psi | U_B | \psi \rangle / \langle \psi | \psi \rangle \quad (18)$$

where  $U_B$  is an operator which came to be known as the Breit operator,

$$U_B^{(1,2)} = -(e^2/4\pi)(\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2 + \alpha_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \alpha_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})/2r, \quad (\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \quad (19)$$

and  $\psi$  is a normalizable solution of (16).



### 4.2.3 Reduction to large components.

Finally, Breit used a procedure, which came to be known as “a reduction to large components”, to obtain from (16) and (18) the previously known forms of the operators which gave  $\alpha^2 Ry$  level shifts. Recall first that in the standard representation of the Dirac matrices it is convenient to organize the four components of the Dirac wave function  $\psi(1)$  of an electron into two Pauli spinors,  $\psi_U(1)$ , the first and second (or upper) components of  $\psi$ , and  $\psi_L(1)$ , the third and fourth (or lower) components of  $\psi(1)$ . For a hydrogenic bound state  $\psi_L$  is of order  $(v/c)\psi_U$ , so in this context the upper are the “large” and the lower are the “small” components of  $\psi(1)$ , respectively. One can similarly decompose a 16-component spinor  $\psi(1, 2)$  into upper-upper components  $\psi_{UU}(1, 2)$ , lower-upper components  $\psi_{LU}(1, 2)$ , etc. Breit wrote down the four coupled equations for the  $\psi_{XY}$  which follow from (16) and from three of these obtained *approximations* for  $\psi_{LU}$ ,  $\psi_{UL}$ , and  $\psi_{LL}$  in terms of  $\psi_{UU}$ , the large-large components. When substituted in the remaining equation the result is an equation for  $\psi_{UU}$  which reduces to (3) in the extreme n.r. limit and contains further terms which can be identified as the previously known spin-self-orbit, kinetic energy, and spin-independent contact interactions. Further, on using the leading approximations to the small components (e.g.  $\psi_{LU}(1, 2) \approx (\alpha_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_1^{op}/2m)\psi_{UU}(1, 2)$ ) in the expression (18), Breit found that  $\Delta E$  reduced to the expectation value with the nonrelativistic wave function of the orbit-orbit, spin-other-orbit, and spin-spin interactions mentioned above.

### 4.3 Critique of the early work

The most serious flaw of Breit’s work is the circumstance that the zero-order equation, the Dirac-Coulomb equation (16), has no bound states; that is,  $H_{DC}$  has no normalizable eigenfunctions! This startling fact was first pointed out by Brown and Ravenhall, some 20 years after Breit’s work.[6] Its validity is most easily seen by first turning off  $U_C(r)$  in  $H_{DC}$ . The resulting Hamiltonian does have normalizable eigenfunctions, of the form  $\psi_{mn}^{(o)} = u_m(1)u_n(2)$ , with  $u_m(1)$  and  $u_n(2)$  denoting normalizable eigenfunction of  $h_D^{ext}(1)$  and  $h_D^{ext}(2)$ , with energies  $\epsilon_m$  and  $\epsilon_n$ , respectively. But such product states are degenerate in energy with similar product functions in which, say, “1” is in a continuum state with positive energy  $\epsilon_1 > m$  and “2” in a continuum state

with negative energy  $\epsilon_2 < -m$  and  $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_m + \epsilon_n$ . Since the sum  $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$  can be kept constant with  $\epsilon_1$  increasing and  $\epsilon_2$  decreasing, the degeneracy is continuous. Thus, turning on any interaction which has non-zero matrix elements between positive- and negative-energy eigenfunctions of  $H_{CD}^{(o)}$ , such as  $e^2/r_{12}$ , will lead to a mixture of  $\psi_{mn}^{(o)}$  with a sea of non-normalizable states, i.e. to “continuum dissolution.” [7]

The CD problem undermines **both** the derivation of the correction terms *not* associated with transverse photon exchange and the derivation of (18), which purports to take these into account. However, suppose one overlooks the CD problem and i) considers the wave function  $\psi^{(o)}(1, 2)$  with components

$$\psi_{LU}^{(o)}(1, 2) \approx (\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_1/2m)\psi_{UU}^{(o)}(1, 2), \quad (20)$$

etc., with  $\psi_{UU}^{(o)}(1, 2)$  identified with the n.r. SP wave function, as an approximation to an eigenfunction of an as yet unspecified relativistic zero-order Hamiltonian, (ii) accepts the formula (18) and evaluates it with the function  $\psi^{(o)}(1, 2)$ , as was done by Breit. On carrying out some integration by parts and being careful to keep nonvanishing surface terms, one finds that, apart from the terms found by him, there is an additional term, a spin-spin contact interaction between electrons[8, 9]:

$$U_{s-s}^{cont} = -(8\pi/3)(e^2/4\pi)\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \delta(\mathbf{r})m^{-2}. \quad (21)$$

This term is simply the counterpart of the Fermi contact interaction between an electron and a proton, which had been known for many years previously in the context of the hydrogen hyperfine structure. It is somewhat scandalous that it took so many years to include this effect in fine-structure calculations in atomic physics.

In summary, Breit’s theory of the helium atom was flawed both on conceptual and technical grounds. To a large extent the reason that this was not noticed for more than two decades is that he got the “expected answer” for terms previously known and that experiments were not precise enough to measure level shifts of order  $\alpha^2 Ry$  with great accuracy.

A sign that something was badly amiss with the general theory should have come from the following fact. Breit briefly considered the possibility of treating  $U_B$  nonperturbatively by adding it to  $U_C$  and using as a starting point what I call the Dirac-Coulomb-Breit (DCB) Hamiltonian:

$$H_{DCB}(1, 2) = h_D^{ext}(1) + h_D^{ext}(2) + U_C(r_{12}) + U_B(r_{12}) \quad (22)$$

However, he soon noted that use of  $U_B$  in second-order perturbation theory led to strange results: The contribution from negative-energy states is readily seen be of order  $< U_B^2/4m >$  and since  $U_B^2 \sim U_C^2$  this is of order  $\alpha^2 Ry$ , as large as the first-order contribution of  $U_B$ ! So the Breit operator always came with the caveat: It was to be used only in first-order perturbation theory.

Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that Breit's work was a pioneering example of the effort to derive effective potentials from quantum field theory, apparently accomplished when the first paper on the general quantum theory of fields by Heisenberg and Pauli was available only in preprint form.

## 5 Quantum field theory of two-electron atoms: Foundations and level-shifts to order $\alpha^3 Ry$

### 5.1 Foundations

In the 50's, motivated by the increasingly accurate experimental results which were becoming available, e.g. for the splitting of the  $2^3P$  states and for the ionization energy, the foundation of the theory of the level-structure of  $He$  and  $He$ -like ions was reexamined, independently by H. Araki[10] and me.[11] The starting point for both these studies was a generalization of the two-body Bethe-Salpeter equation[12] to include an external field, an integral equation for a 16-component spinor function  $\psi(x_1, x_2)$ , of the form

$$\psi(x_1, x_2) = -i \int K_a(x_1, x_3) K_b(x_2, x_4) G(x_3, x_4; x_5, x_6) \psi(x_5, x_6) d\tau. \quad (23)$$

Here  $d\tau = d^4x_3 d^4x_4 d^4x_5 d^4x_6$  is the product of four-dimensional volume elements,  $K_a(x_1, x_3)$  is the external-field Feynman propagator for electron "a", and  $G$  is an interaction kernel, constructed from two-particle-irreducible  $x$ -space Feynman graphs, involving the emission and absorption of one or more photons. In these graphs, the electron propagators are the  $K_a$  and the photon propagators depend on the choice of gauge. If one works in Coulomb gauge one can, by an extension of a method of Salpeter,[12] derive an exact equation for the spatial part  $\phi(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$  of the equal-times wave function  $\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, t; \mathbf{x}_2, t)$  associated with a stationary state of energy  $E$ ,

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, t; \mathbf{x}_2, t) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) e^{-iEt}. \quad (24)$$

This equation, which I shall not write down, is still linear but involves the eigenvalue  $E$  nonlinearly. On neglecting effects associated with electron-positron pairs and transverse photons in this equation, one arrives at what I call the “no-pair Coulomb-ladder (NPCL) equation”:

$$H_{++}\phi_C(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = E\phi_C(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2). \quad (25)$$

Here

$$H_{++} = h_D^{ext}(1) + h_D^{ext}(2) + L_{++}U_C(r_{12})L_{++} \quad (26)$$

is the NPCL Hamiltonian and

$$L_{++} \equiv L_+(1)L_+(2) \quad (27)$$

is the product of external-field positive-energy projection operators  $L_+(i)$ , defined by

$$L_+(i) = \Sigma | \phi_n(i) \rangle \langle \phi_n(i) |. \quad (28)$$

Here the sum is over the positive-energy eigenstates  $\phi_n$  (bound and continuum) of  $h_D^{(ext)}(i)$ . The NPCL wave functions  $\phi_C$  of physical interest satisfy the constraint

$$L_+(i)\phi = \phi \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (29)$$

This is consistent with (25) since the  $L_+(i)$  commute with  $H_{++}$ ,

$$[L_+(i), H_{++}] = 0. \quad (30)$$

The nomenclature “NPCL” arises from the fact that (25) effectively sums all time-ordered diagrams which involve repeated Coulomb scattering of the electrons in the presence of the external field, with no electron-positron pairs present in intermediate states.

The NPCL equation (25) has the following features: (a) Unlike the DC equation (16) it does not suffer from continuum dissolution, because when  $U_C(r_{12})$  is turned on the projection operator  $L_{++}$  prevents the mixing referred to above. (b) It is exact to all orders in the external field strength. (c) Because of the condition (29) it can be reduced without approximation to  $SP$  form, with the eigenvalue  $E$  still appearing linearly. (d) This relativistic  $SP$  equation reduces to (2) in the extreme  $NR$  limit and contains all the  $\alpha^2 Ry$  corrections not associated with transverse photons.

The NPCL wavefunction can therefore be used as the basis of a perturbative treatment of the four-dimensional equation (23), as developed in Ref. 11, to compute effects associated with transverse-photon exchange and virtual pairs. In particular, the leading effects of transverse-photon exchange, of order  $\alpha^2 Ry$ , can be incorporated by simply adding  $U_B$  to  $U_C$  in (26):

$$H'_{++} = h_D^{ext}(1) + h_D^{ext}(2) + L_{++}[U_C(r_{12}) + U_B(r_{12})]L_{++}. \quad (31)$$

The corresponding equation

$$H'_{++}\phi'_C = E'\phi'_C \quad (32)$$

has, like (25), a clear-cut origin in field theory: It is obtained from (23) by keeping the one-photon exchange graph in the interaction kernel  $\underline{G}$ , but neglecting the time-component  $k_0$  in the factor  $(k^2 + i\epsilon)^{-1}$  appearing in the transverse-photon propagator. It can be regarded as a QFT-based replacement for the patchwork approach to fine structure. The eigenvalues  $E'$  incorporate **all** fine-structure effects of order  $\alpha^2 Ry$  and of course some of the effects of order  $\alpha^3 Ry$  and higher.

The basic difference between the modern approach and the earlier one is not the four-dimensional formalism, which is mainly a convenient tool and can to a large extent be dispensed with, but that QED incorporates the ideas of Dirac's hole theory rather than the Dirac's one-electron theory. The appearance of the projection operators is the mathematical expression, in the present context, of the idea that the negative-energy states are filled and transitions to them are forbidden by the Pauli exclusion principle.

## 5.2 $\alpha^2 Ry$ and $\alpha^3 Ry$ level-shifts

Analysis of (26) shows that the low-lying eigenvalues have the form

$$E = 2m + W + \delta W_C \quad (33)$$

where  $W$  is the n.r. eigenvalue of (2) and

$$\delta W_C = \delta W_C^{(2)} + \delta W_C^{(3)} + \dots \quad (34)$$

The first term in (34), of order  $\alpha^2 Ry$ , is defined by

$$\delta W_C^{(2)} = \langle \phi | -\mathbf{p}_1^4/8m^3 + (\pi\alpha/2m^2)[Z\delta(\mathbf{r}_1) - \delta(\mathbf{r}_{12})] + 1 \leftrightarrow 2 | \phi \rangle \quad (35)$$

$$+ \langle \phi | (\alpha/4m^2)\sigma_1 \cdot (Z\mathbf{r}_1 \times \mathbf{p}_1/r_1^3 - \mathbf{r}_{12} \times \mathbf{p}_1/r_{12}^3) + 1 \leftrightarrow 2 | \phi \rangle \quad (36)$$

and is the sum, for each electron, of a kinetic energy correction, a spin-independent contact interaction, and a spin-self-orbit interaction. The latter terms are natural extensions of those found from the Dirac equation in the one-electron case, if one recognizes that electron “2” serves as the source of an electric field just as well as the nucleus. The quotes on the  $\mathbf{p}^4$  term serve as a reminder that this term must be evaluated as

$$- \langle \mathbf{p}_1^2 \phi | \mathbf{p}_1^2 \phi \rangle / 8m^3, \quad (37)$$

to avoid double counting.[8] The second term in (34), defined by

$$\delta W_C^{(3)} = -(\alpha^2/m^2)(\pi/2 + 5/3) \langle \phi | \delta(\mathbf{r}_{12}) | \phi \rangle, \quad (38)$$

is an s.i. contact term of order  $\alpha^3 Ry$ , arising directly from (26).

The remaining corrections of order  $\alpha^2 Ry$  and another correction of order  $\alpha^3 Ry$  may be obtained by a similar analysis starting from (31) or, equivalently, by evaluating

$$\delta E_B = \langle \phi_C | U_B | \phi_C \rangle \quad (39)$$

with a sufficiently accurate approximation to  $\phi_C$ . The result is

$$\delta E_B = \delta W_B^{(2)} + \delta W_B^{(3)} + \dots \quad (40)$$

The first term in (40) which comes from reduction of the Breit operator, using approximations such as (20), is given by

$$\delta W_B^{(2)} = \langle \phi | U_{o-o} + U_{s-o-o} + U_{s-s} | \phi \rangle \quad (41)$$

with

$$U_{o-o} = (\alpha/2m^2)r_{12}^{-1}[\mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{r}} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{p}_1) \cdot \mathbf{p}_2] \quad (42)$$

a form of the orbit-orbit interaction,

$$U_{s-o-o} = -(\alpha/2m^2)r_{12}^{-3}[\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}_{12} \times \mathbf{p}_2 + 1 \leftrightarrow 2] \quad (43)$$

the spin-other-orbit interaction, and  $U_{s-s}$  the full spin-spin interaction, including the contact term (21):

$$U_{s-s} = (\alpha/4m^2)[r_{12}^{-3}(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - 3\sigma_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \sigma_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) - (8\pi/3)\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \delta(\mathbf{r})]. \quad (44)$$

The second term in (40) is a spin-dependent partner of (38) and contributes to fine-structure splitting in order  $\alpha^3 Ry$ :

$$\delta W_B^{(3)} = -(\alpha^2/m^2)(4/3)(\pi/2 + 1) \langle \phi | \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \delta(\mathbf{r}_{12}) | \phi \rangle. \quad (45)$$

The corrections (38) and (45) are both associated with the fact that the usual approximations to the LU, UL and LL components of the 16-component wave function are not sufficiently accurate at short distances, for the purpose at hand.

The computation of the remaining terms of order  $\alpha^3 Ry$  requires a return to (23) and i) keeping  $k_0$  in the transverse photon propagator (this corresponds to taking into account the Coulomb interaction during the exchange of one transverse photon), ii) keeping the irreducible two-photon exchange graph in the kernel  $G$ , and iii) keeping graphs associated with radiative corrections, the latter of course include self-energy effects, associated in hydrogen with the Lamb-shift. In  $He$ , such effects were first estimated by Kabir and Salpeter.[13] So much for the 50's. Later work in this area will be mentioned in Sec. 8.

## 6 Radiative decays of helium: Enter the Sun once more

Because spin-dependent forces are weak if  $Z$  is not too large, the states of  $He$  or low- $Z$   $He$ -like ions may be classified into singlet and triplet states, corresponding to total spin 0 and 1, respectively. The lowest lying triplet S-state, described as  $2^3S_1$ , lies above the  $1^1S_0$  ground state and is expected to be very long-lived, because of the form of the (nonrelativistic) radiation operator for one-photon decay, viz.

$$R_{rad} = (e/\sqrt{2\omega})\Sigma(\mathbf{p}_i/m - i\mathbf{s}_i \times \mathbf{k}/m) \cdot \epsilon^* \exp(-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i). \quad (46)$$

The orbital part of  $R_{rad}$  vanishes between  $L = 0$  states and in the dipole approximation the spin part of  $R_{rad}$  becomes proportional to the total spin  $\mathbf{S}$ . So the matrix element for the would-be magnetic dipole transition ( $\Delta J = \pm 1, 0$ ; no parity change):

$$2^3S_1 \rightarrow 1^1S_0 + \gamma \quad (47)$$

is doubly vanishing in this approximation: The matrix element of  $\mathbf{S}$  is zero between a triplet and a singlet spin wave function and the spatial parts of the initial and final states, belonging to different eigenvalues of (3), are orthogonal.

What then is the rate for this decay? This problem was apparently first studied in 1940 by Breit and Teller (BT) who, motivated by questions in astrophysics, wrote a pioneering paper on the  $1\gamma$  and  $2\gamma$  decays of  $H$  and  $He$ . [14] They estimated that  $R(2^3S_1 \rightarrow ^1S_0 + \tau) \approx 10^{-24}R$  where  $R$  denotes the rate expected for an E1 decay of unit oscillator strength ( $\approx 10^9 s^{-1}$ ), corresponding to a lifetime for the  $1\gamma$  decay of  $10^8$  years! This was the last word on the subject for almost three decades, when the Sun enters our story once more. In 1969 it was noted by A. H. Gabriel and C. Jordan [15] that certain lines seen in the soft x-ray spectrum of the solar corona correspond in wavelength to the transition (47) in certain  $He$ -like ions, ranging from C V to Si XIII, and suggested that these transitions were in fact responsible for the observed lines. However, they noted that the intensities for these lines would be extremely small, if the result of BT were simply scaled up, even with a high power of  $Z$ .

Soon thereafter H. Griem pointed out that BT vastly underestimated the rate for (47) in  $He$  and made an estimate, patterned on the (largely) correct calculation of BT for the hydrogenic decay  $2^{1/2}S_{1/2} \rightarrow 2^{1/2}S_{1/2} + 1\gamma$ , which indicated that the Gabriel-Jordan interpretation was plausible. [16] A similar estimate was made by G. Feinberg. [17] At about the same time the whole subject was brought down to Earth, so to speak, with the development of beam foil spectroscopy and the terrestrial measurement of such rates, beginning with that of (47) in  $Ar^{16+}$  by Marrus and Schmieder. [18] This raised interest in the whole subject and led to the development of a general QED based theory of such decays. [19, 20]

A correct starting point for the calculation of one-photon decays in  $H$ -like ions which includes relativistic effects is the equation

$$M_1 = \langle \psi_f | \alpha \cdot \epsilon^* e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} | \psi_i \rangle . \quad (48)$$

where the  $\psi$  's are normalized solutions of (10). This is also what one would write down in Dirac's one-electron theory and it yields the correct leading terms for all such decays. Thus the counterpart of (48) for a two-electron system is

$$M_2 = \Sigma \langle \psi_f(1, 2) | \alpha_i \cdot \epsilon^* e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i} | \psi_i(1, 2) \rangle , \quad (49)$$



where now the  $\psi$ 's are solutions of (25), which is according to the above discussion a QED-based analogue of (48). However, it turns out that (49) does not give the full leading terms for the M1 decays in question: One must go back to QED and include time-ordered graphs in which, e.g., the Coulomb field of electron "1" or the nucleus creates a virtual  $e^- - e^+$  pair and the positron annihilates with electron "2" to create the emitted photon. *So field theory rears its head again.* The final result is

$$M(2^3S_1 \rightarrow 1^1S_0 + \gamma) \approx 2i\Sigma_{fi}T_{fi} \quad (50)$$

where

$$T_{fi} = \langle \phi_f | \mathbf{p}_1^2/3m^2 + k^2r_1^2/12 - r_1U'(r_1)/6m | \phi_i \rangle \quad (51)$$

and

$$\Sigma_{fi} = \langle \chi_f | \sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{k} \times \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*/m | \chi_i \rangle \quad (52)$$

with  $\chi_i$  and  $\chi_f$  the triplet and singlet spin wave functions. The corresponding decay rate is then found to be

$$R_{He-like} = (2/3)(8\alpha k^3/m^2) |T_{fi}|^2 \quad (53)$$

The evaluation of  $T_{fi}$  for large  $Z$  was first carried out by Drake using many-parameter variational wave functions and an expansion in powers of  $1/Z$ . Because of early discrepancies in the cases of  $Ar^{16+}$  and  $Cl^{15+}$ , further work to estimate and include radiative, recoil, retardation and relativistic corrections were carried out by various workers.[21] It turns out that for  $Z$  not too small, larger than say 15, these results can be put together to write a cooperative explicit formula:[21]

$$R_{He-like} = (2/3)\alpha(\alpha Z)^{10}(m/972)[1 - 4.10/Z + 6.7/Z^2 + 1.07(\alpha Z)^2] \quad (54)$$

which could, conservatively, be expected to be accurate to better than 2% in the range  $15 < Z < 40$ . Comparison with data ranging from sulfur ( $Z = 16$ ) to krypton ( $Z = 36$ ), for which the lifetime ranges from 700 ns to .2 ns, a factor of more than 3000, indeed showed agreement of theory and experiment to within a few percent in all cases. When one includes  $He$ , for which the lifetime of the  $2^3S_1$  state is about  $10^4s$ ,[22] albeit with a rather large (30%) error, and evaluates  $T_{fi}$  with a Hylleraas type of wave function, the agreement extends over a range covering 14 orders of magnitude. This was surely a triumph of QED in a rather unusual domain. Again, recent work in this area will be noted in Sec. 8.

## 7 Retarded van der Waals forces and Rydberg states of helium.

Van der Waals forces are, in the first instance, the (spin-independent) electromagnetic forces which act between atoms at separations  $R$  large compared to atomic size  $a$ . Two years after the development of quantum mechanics, S.C. Wang and later F. London showed that the electrostatic interaction between the constituents of two neutral atoms gives rise to an effective interatomic potential of the form  $U = -C/R^6$  for  $R \gg a$  (often called the London potential).[23] But it took two decades after the development of QED, for H.B.G. Casimir and D. Polder to point out that the inclusion of the effects of transverse photon exchange between the electrons leads to a potential which falls off as  $R^{-7}$  at very large separations, of the order of the maximum wavelength for electric dipole excitation.[24] Inclusion of transverse photon exchange corresponds, in the framework of QFT, to taking into account the retarded character of electromagnetic interactions in CED. Thus one refers to the potential at very large  $R$  either as the Casimir-Polder potential or as the retarded van der Waals potential. Unfortunately, because the potential is very small in this region, direct experimental detection of the retarded character of atom-atom van der Waals forces has proved to be elusive.

On general grounds, one expects that related retardation effects manifest themselves between a polarizable neutral system  $A$  and a charged system  $B$ , or between two charged systems  $A$  and  $B$ . However in these cases, such effects will only be corrections to the dominant forces, corresponding to the electric dipole potential  $U_{dip} = -\alpha_A^e e_B^2 / 2R^4$  and the Coulomb potential  $U_C$ , respectively. It was pointed out by L. Spruch that precise measurement of the fine structure of Rydberg levels in helium might be able to detect such corrections and S. Lundgren and co-workers undertook a series of experiments to detect such effects, specifically on the  $n = 10$  levels.[25] This stimulated a great deal of further work on the QED aspects by theorists including Spruch and J.F. Babb, and C.K. Au, G. Feinberg and myself.[25] There is only one point I will elaborate on in this regard, by way of making a connection with the beginning of the modern theory of helium. G.W.F. Drake, by using a doubled set of Hylleraas-type wave functions and modern computer power, has extended the variational methods pioneered by Hylleraas so long ago to achieve unprecedented accuracy in computing the eigenvalues and eigenfunc-

tions of the nonrelativistic Hamiltonian (3).[25] R. Drachman has achieved very high accuracy for the large  $n$ , large  $l$  states, by using a systematic perturbation expansion in the residual interaction  $e^2(1/r_{12} - 1/r_1)$  of the outer electron with the core.[25] Thus helium now approaches hydrogen in having an exactly-solvable zero-order problem. As a result, the calculation of relatively high-order relativistic and QED type corrections in helium and helium-like ions has become much more meaningful than in earlier decades, as emphasized below.

## 8 Some recent developments; Concluding remarks

As described in Sec. 5, the order  $\alpha^3 Ry$  corrections to the low-lying  $\alpha^2 Ry$  fine structure of helium were calculated long ago. Increased experimental precision and the possibility of using *He* fine-structure for obtaining values of the fine-structure constant competitive with other methods, has led to improvements on the earlier calculations and to the computation of still higher-order effects. Helium has also been used as a testing ground for techniques vital for studying atoms with more than two electrons, such as relativistic many-body perturbation theory (MBPT), configuration interaction (CI) methods, and multi-configuration Dirac-Fock (MCDF) methods.

A major step in the direction of going to higher orders was taken by M.H. Douglas and N. Kroll, who, using the methods of Ref. 11, obtained formulas for fine-structure splitting of order  $\alpha^4 Ry$ . [26] Recently this work has been improved and extended by several theoretical groups. T. Zhang and G.W.F. Drake [27] and Eides *et al.* [28] have verified the correctness of the somewhat phenomenological treatment of radiative corrections by Douglas and Kroll. Z.-C. Yan and Drake [29] have computed the fine-structure of the  $2^3P$  state in *He* and low- $Z$  *He*-like ions to a few parts in  $10^9$ , obtaining good agreement with recent high precision measurements [30] for  $Z = 3, 5$ , and  $9$  but not for  $Z = 2$  and  $4$ . Complementary calculations for higher  $Z$  have been carried out by M.H. Chen *et al.*, [31] using relativistic CI methods, and by D.R. Plante *et al.* [32], using relativistic MBPT methods. In a heroic computational effort, T. Zhang has obtained corrections of order  $\alpha^4 \ln \alpha Ry$  to energy levels and corrections of order  $\alpha^5 \ln \alpha Ry$  and  $\alpha^5 Ry$  to fine-structure splitting. [33] These

will be important in using helium fine structure to obtain an independent determination of  $\alpha$ ; a recent measurement by Myers *et al.*[34] of the fine-structure splitting of the  $2^3P$  splitting for  $Z = 7$  is of sufficient accuracy to be sensitive to such corrections.

Much progress has been made in recent years in developing new techniques for the accurate calculation of self-energy corrections in  $He$  and  $He$ -like ions, i.e. corrections which are the counterpart of what is referred to as the Lamb shift in  $H$  and  $H$ -like ions. A recent example, where further references may be found, is the work of Persson *et al.*[35], in which good agreement is found with experimental results of Marrs *et al.*[36] on several  $He$ -like ions, ranging from  $Z = 32$  to  $Z = 83$ .

With regard to decay rates, W.R. Johnson *et al.*[37] have carried out extensive relativistic calculations of radiative decay rates in the helium iso-electronic sequence, using the no-pair Hamiltonian (26) as a starting point. These calculations are so accurate that disagreement with experimental values could be interpreted as associated with radiative corrections to decay rates, a relatively unexplored subject. Very recently, P. Indelicato[38] has extended the MCDF method to the calculation of the forbidden magnetic-dipole decays, discussed in Sec. 6.

As a final example, in a quite different direction, of the way in which helium engages the attention of physicists, I refer you to a paper by Deilamian *et al.*[39], who have made a search for  $He$  states which are forbidden by the Pauli antisymmetry principle, by way of putting an upper bound on its hypothetical violation.

The story goes that when a mathematics professor was asked by a student “What is the use of number theory?”, he replied: “Number theory is useful because you can get a Ph.D. with it.” As one may infer from the above saga, helium has certainly been useful for getting a doctoral degree, and its uses in the laboratory and in providing impressive views of football stadiums are well known. In a more serious vein, helium, together with its ionic partners, is likely to continue for a long time to come its unique role as a laboratory for the application of quantum field theory and the techniques of mathematical physics to a system of fundamental physical interest. It provides a unique setting for the study of the electron-electron interaction, the electron being one of the few observed particles which are still usefully regarded as elementary. While helium may be inert chemically, it remains highly active intellectually.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation. I am grateful to I. Feranchuk, A. Gazizov, and O. Shadyro for their hospitality and assistance during my stay in Minsk.

## References

- [1] I. Asimov, *Asimov's Biographical Encyclopedia of Science and Technology, 2nd Revised Edition* (Doubleday, Garden City, Long Island, 1982).
- [2] E. Hylleraas, Z. Phys. **48**, 469 (1928); *ibid.* **54**, 347 (1929).
- [3] C.G. Darwin, Philos. Mag. **39**, 537 (1920).
- [4] J.B. Gaunt, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **122**, 513 (1929).
- [5] G. Breit, Phys. Rev. **34**, 553 (1929).
- [6] G. Brown and D.G. Ravenhall, Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A **208**, 552 (1951).
- [7] J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. A **25**, 348 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1023 (1985).
- [8] J. Sucher and H.M. Foley, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1966 (1955).
- [9] A. Sessler and H.M. Foley, Phys. Rev. **92**, 1321 (1953).
- [10] H. Araki, Prog. Theoret. Phys. **17**, 6191 (1957).
- [11] J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1010 (1958); Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1958 (unpublished).
- [12] E.E. Salpeter and H.A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. **84**, 1232 (1951); E.E. Salpeter, Phys. Rev. **87**, 378 (1952).
- [13] P. Kabir and E.E. Salpeter, Bul. Amer. Phys. Soc. **1**, 46 (1956).
- [14] G. Breit and E. Teller, Astrophys. J. **91**, 215 (1940).

- [15] A.H. Gabriel and C. Jordan, Nature **221**, 947 (1969); Mon. Notices, Roy. Astron. Soc. **145**, 241 (1969).
- [16] H.K. Griem, Astrophys. J. **156**, L103 (1969); **161**, L555 (1970).
- [17] G. Feinberg (private communication, 1969).
- [18] R. Marrus and R.W. Schmieder, Phys. Lett. A **32**, 431 (1970); Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 1245 (1970).
- [19] G. Feinberg and J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 681(1971).
- [20] G.W.F. Drake, Phys. Rev. A **3**, 908 (1971).
- [21] For a review, see J. Sucher, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41**, 1781 (1978).
- [22] H.W. Moos and J.R. Woodworth, Phys. Rev. A **12**, 908 (1971).
- [23] S.C. Wang, Phys. Z. **28**, 663 (1927); F. London, Z. Phys. Chem. **11**, 222 (1930).
- [24] H.B.G. Casimir and D. Polder, Phys. Rev. **73**, 360 (1947).
- [25] For reviews, with many references, see *Long-Range Casimir Forces: Theory and Recent Experiments in Atomic Systems*, edited by F.S. Levin and D.A. Micha (Plenum, New York, 1993).
- [26] M.H. Douglas and N.M. Kroll, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **82**, 89 (1974).
- [27] T. Zhang and G.W.F. Drake, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 4078 (1994); **73** (E) 1994.
- [28] M. Eides, I.B. Kriplovich, and A.I. Milstein, Phys. Lett. B **339** 275 (1994).
- [29] Z.-C. Yan and G.W.F. Drake, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 479 (1995).
- [30] D. Shiner, R. Dixon, and P.Zhao, Phys.Rev. Lett. **72**, 1802 (1994).
- [31] M.H. Chen, K.T. Cheng, and W.R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 3692 (1993).

- [32] D.R. Plante, W.R. Johnson, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 3519 (1994).
- [33] T. Zhang, University of Windsor preprints and Phys. Rev. A, to appear.
- [34] E.G. Myers, D.J.H. Howie, J.K. Thompson and J.D. Silver, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4899 (1996).
- [35] H. Persson, S. Salomonson, P. Sunnergren, and I. Lindgren, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 204 (1996).
- [36] R.E. Marrs, S.R. Schneider, and Th. Stöhlker, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 3577 (1995).
- [37] W.R.Johnson, D.R. Plante, and J. Saperstein, in *Advances in Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* **31**, 1993 (D.R.Bates and B. Bederson, eds.), Academic Press, New York.
- [38] P. Indelicato, Phys.Rev. Lett. **77**, 3323 (1996).
- [39] K. Deilamian, J. Gillaspy, and D.E. Kelleher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4787 (1995).